

1 RODNEY J. JACOB, ESQ.  
2 DANIEL M. BENJAMIN, ESQ.  
3 JENNIFER A. CALVO-QUITUGUA, ESQ.  
4 CALVO & CLARK, LLP  
5 Attorneys at Law  
6 655 South Marine Corps Drive, Suite 202  
7 Tamuning, Guam 96913  
8 Telephone: (671) 646-9355  
9 Facsimile: (671) 646-9403  
10

11 CHRISTOPHER E. CHALSEN, ESQ.  
12 MICHAEL M. MURRAY, ESQ.  
13 LAWRENCE T. KASS, ESQ.  
14 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP  
15 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza  
16 New York, New York 10005  
17 Telephone: (212) 530-5000  
18 Facsimile: (212) 822-5796  
19

20 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
21 FUJITSU LIMITED AND  
22 FUJITSU MICROELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.  
23

24

25 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
26

27 DISTRICT OF GUAM  
28

17 NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORP. and  
18 NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORP. U.S.A.,  
19

CIVIL CASE NO. 06-CV-00025

Plaintiff,

DEFENDANT'S SUR-REPLY IN  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO EXCEED NUMBER OF  
INTERROGATORIES AND  
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

20 -v-  
21 FUJITSU LIMITED, FUJITSU  
22 MICROELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
23

(ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED)

Defendants.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           Defendants Fujitsu Limited and Fujitsu Microelectronics America, Inc. hereby submit this  
 2 sur-reply to respond to Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Their Motion to Exceed Number of  
 3 Interrogatories and Requests for Admission ("Reply"). Defendants address below new issues  
 4 improperly raised for the first time in Plaintiffs' Reply and respectfully request that the Court  
 5 disregard these new arguments and alleged facts. Alternatively, if the Court decides to consider  
 6 Plaintiffs' new material, then Defendants respectfully request that the Court also consider the  
 7 responses set forth herein. In sum, Plaintiffs' allegations are erroneous, misleading, and  
 8 irrelevant.

9           **I. PLAINTIFFS' ALLEGATION CONCERNING PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS  
 10 IS MISLEADING AND IRRELEVANT**

11           Plaintiffs allege in their Reply that Defendants have failed to produce documents "despite  
 12 receiving over 1500 document requests from Plaintiffs." (Reply at 4.) Plaintiffs, however,  
 13 neglect to inform the Court that the *vast* majority of these document requests – 1,400 - were *not*  
 14 *actually served* on Defendants, but are "merits-based discovery, which [Plaintiffs were] sending  
 15 early." (See Exh. A hereto.) Notwithstanding this omission, Plaintiffs have failed to draw any  
 16 correlation between the large number of document requests they have served and this Motion.  
 17 Whether or not Defendants have produced documents is simply irrelevant to this Motion.

18           Moreover, due to the sensitive nature of the information sought by the document requests,  
 19 document production in this case could not go forward until a protective order was put in place.  
 20 The parties have recently agreed to a Stipulated Protective Order, which the Court entered on  
 21 February 26, 2007. (See Dkt. No. 162.) The parties have further agreed to a timetable for the  
 22 production of documents, rendering Plaintiffs' concerns about the production of documents moot.  
 23 (See Dkt. No. 148.)

24           **II. PLAINTIFFS CASE LAW IS NOT RELEVANT TO THE RELIEF SOUGHT**

25           Plaintiffs have yet to cite *any* case where a court has granted a blank check to a party to  
 26 propound interrogatories or requests for admission, as Plaintiffs have requested from this Court.  
 27 Plaintiffs cite *Commissariat A L'Energie Atomique v. Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corp.*, 395 F.3d  
 28 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2005) and *Beverly Hills Fan Co. v. Royal Sovereign Corp.*, 21 F.3d 1558 (Fed.

1 Cir. 1994). But these decisions address only stream of commerce issues, not the proper procedure  
 2 for obtaining additional interrogatories or requests for admission. Given the utter lack of support  
 3 for such relief, it is not surprising that, when Plaintiffs made a similar request for additional  
 4 interrogatories and requests for admission in the related Northern District of California case (*i.e.*,  
 5 *Fujitsu Ltd. v. Nanya Tech. Corp.*, No. 4:06-cv-06613 (CW)), the court did not grant their request.  
 6 (See Exh. A at 11 & Exh. B attached to Dkt. No. 159.)

7 This Court's existing discovery procedures are more than sufficient for carrying out  
 8 discovery in this case, including this Court's procedures for requesting additional interrogatories  
 9 and requests for admission set forth in Local Rule 33.1. Plaintiffs' Motion requests extraordinary  
 10 relief that is contrary to this rule, and the supporting case law.

11 **III. CONCLUSION**

12 Plaintiffs have asked for a clearly unreasonable and unjustified number of interrogatories  
 13 and requests for admission, likely in the hope that this Court will compromise and give them  
 14 some lesser, but still large, number. However, Plaintiffs' have failed to justify *any* departure from  
 15 the procedures set forth in the local rules, and should follow those rules if they seek additional  
 16 interrogatories and requests for admission, *i.e.*, they should submit each such additional  
 17 interrogatory or request for admission and provide justification for each.

18 Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that Plaintiffs' Motion be denied in its  
 19 entirety.

20 Dated this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007.

21  
 22                           **CALVO & CLARK, LLP**  
 23                           **MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY**  
 24                           **& MCCLOY LLP**  
 25                           *Attorneys for Defendants*  
 26                           Fujitsu Limited and  
 27                           Fujitsu Microelectronics America, Inc.

28  
 26 By:   
 27                           JENNIFER A. CALVO-QUITUGUA

# **EXHIBIT A**

LAW OFFICES

**TEKER TORRES & TEKER, P.C.**

Lawrence J. Teker  
Phillip Torres  
Samuel S. Teker  
Joseph C. Razzano

Suite 2A, 130 Aspinall Avenue  
Hagåtña, Guam 96910-5018  
Telephone: (671) 477-9891/4  
Facsimile: (671) 472-2601  
Email: [jrazzano@tttguamlawyers.com](mailto:jrazzano@tttguamlawyers.com)

Of Counsel:  
Nagatomo Yamaoka

January 31, 2007

Daniel M. Benjamin  
Calvo & Clark, LLP  
655 South Marine Corps Drive  
Suite 202  
Tamuning, Guam 96913



Re: *Nanya Technology Corp., et al v. Fujitsu Limited, et al.*, No. 06-CV-00025  
U. S. District Court, District of Guam

Dear Mr. Benjamin:

Enclosed are 16 sets of discovery requests for Fujitsu Limited ("Fujitsu"). Specifically, they are Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Production of Documents through Plaintiffs' Sixteenth Set of Requests for Production of Documents, directed to Fujitsu in the referenced case. Please note these are merits-based discovery, which we are sending early to provide Fujitsu ample time to gather the responsive materials and respond without the need for any extensions.

As agreed, I am forwarding the requests via email.

Very truly yours,



Joseph C. Razzano

Enclosures.